

**REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT
SOUGHT TO BE SEALED**

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)
mmao@bsflp.com
44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 293 6858
Facsimile: (415) 999 9695

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
William Christopher Carmody (*pro hac vice*)
bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (212) 336-8330

Andrew H. Schapiro (*pro hac vice*)
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 705-7400
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

MORGAN & MORGAN
John A. Yanchunis (*pro hac vice*)
jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Telephone: (813) 223-5505

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
stephenbroome@quinnmanuel.com
Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
violatrebicka@quinnmanuel.com
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 443-3000
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

12 Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805
mram@forthepeople.com
13 711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94102
14 Telephone: (415) 358-6913

Attorneys for Defendant; additional counsel listed in signature blocks below

16 Attorneys for Plaintiffs; additional counsel
listed in signature blocks below

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,
JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER
CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO
individually and on behalf of all other
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

V.

GOOGLE LLC.

Defendant.

Case No. 5:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
Courtroom 1 – 4th Floor
Date: February 11, 2022
Time: 12:00 p.m.

1 Pursuant to the Clerk's Notice Setting Case Management Conference (Dkt. 392), and in
 2 advance of the Case Management Conference set for Friday, February 11, at 12:00 p.m., Plaintiffs
 3 and Defendant Google LLC submit this Joint Case Management Statement. The previous Joint Case
 4 Management Statement is Dkt. 275.

5 **1. JURISDICTION AND SERVICE**

6 Google has been served and the Court has jurisdiction over this matter.

7 **2. FACTS**

8 On June 2, 2020, Plaintiffs filed a nationwide putative class action lawsuit against Google,
 9 alleging violations of privacy on behalf of users who utilize private browsing modes, including
 10 Incognito mode in Google's Chrome browser. Dkt. 1. Plaintiffs asserted four causes of
 11 action. *Id.* On September 21, 2020, Plaintiffs filed their Amended Complaint. Dkt. 68. On October
 12 21, 2020, Google moved to dismiss Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint. Dkt. 82. On March 12, 2021,
 13 Judge Koh denied Google's motion to dismiss. Dkt. 113. Pursuant to a stipulated agreement with
 14 Google, Plaintiffs sought leave to file their Second Amended Complaint on April 14, 2021 to include
 15 two new causes of action, i.e., breach of contract and Unfair Competition Law claims, (Dkt. 136-2),
 16 which was granted the next day. Dkt. 138. On May 17, 2021, Google filed its motion to dismiss
 17 the two new claims. Dkt. 164. On December 22, 2021, Judge Koh denied Google's motion to
 18 dismiss. Dkt. 363. Google filed its answer to the Second Amended Complaint on January 14,
 19 2022. Dkt. 387. The case has proceeded through fact discovery for the past 18 months. Fact
 20 discovery is set to close on March 4, 2022; merits expert discovery is set to close on May 19, 2022;
 21 and class certification briefing will commence on May 26, 2022. Dkt. 377.

22 ***Plaintiffs' Statement:***

23 This case concerns Google's collection and use of private browsing information, while
 24 people visit non-Google websites using Google's private browsing mode (called "Incognito" with
 25 Google's Chrome browser) or other private browsing modes. *See* Dkt. 136-1 (operative complaint).
 26 Google assured users that they were "in control of what information [they] share with Google" and
 27 that they could adjust their privacy settings "across [Google's] services" to "control what [Google]
 28 collect[s] and how [their] information is used." SAC ¶¶ 2, 42. To exercise this "control," Google

1 invited users to “browse the web privately,” including through Google’s Incognito mode. SAC ¶
 2 42. But Google in fact – without disclosure or consent – collects, tracks, and stores private browsing
 3 histories, regardless of the user’s choice of browsing mode. “Choice” is thus an illusion. Google
 4 collects and uses people’s private browsing information for Google’s own enrichment. Google does
 5 not dispute this collection, and Judge Koh already rejected many of Google’s contentions in her
 6 motion to dismiss rulings. Dkts. 113, 363.

7 Discovery supports Plaintiffs’ claims, where Google employees described Google’s
 8 Incognito mode (internally, not publicly) as “effectively a lie” (GOOG-BRWN-00630517),
 9 “broken” (GOOG-BRWN-00441285), “misleading” (GOOG-BRWN-00475063), a “confusing
 10 mess” (GOOG-CABR-03827263), and “not truly private” (GOOG-BRWN-00406065), with
 11 concerns about “collecting data without consent in Incognito mode” (GOOG-BRWN-00686207)
 12 and “people operating under a false sense of privacy” (GOOG-BRWN-00457255). Google knew
 13 there were “common misconceptions about private mode” (GOOG-BRWN-00042388), with
 14 Google “over-promising and under-delivering” (GOOG-BRWN-00140297).

15 Google has collected private browsing information from tens of millions of Americans, and
 16 from billions of visits to non-Google websites. One set of internal Google calculations shows that,
 17 over just a 28-day period through November 15, 2018, over [REDACTED] “unique users” browsed over
 18 [REDACTED] webpages using Google’s Incognito mode (GOOG-BRWN-00750077). Google
 19 calculations limited to the United States, for just Android and Apple iOS devices (not including any
 20 computers), and just a 28-day period in 2020, calculates over [REDACTED] “unique users of incognito
 21 mode” (GOOG-BRWN-00601022); *see also* GOOG-BRWN-00406075 (“Incognito mode is used
 22 by [REDACTED] of Chrome users”); GOOG-BRWN-00529122 (“Incognito mode is used by [REDACTED] of Chrome
 23 users, and [REDACTED] use it at least once per week”); GOOG-BRWN-00047631 (“[REDACTED] of weekly Chrome
 24 users browse in Incognito mode at least once a day”).

25 ***Google’s Statement:***

26 Plaintiffs complain that private browsing modes, including Chrome’s Incognito mode, do
 27 not provide *complete* privacy from Google and other entities that provide services to websites when
 28 browsing the Internet. But Google did not present private browsing or Incognito mode in that

1 manner. In fact, Incognito mode works exactly as described in Google’s disclosures. Each and
 2 every time a user initiates a private browsing session on Google’s Chrome browser (“Incognito”
 3 mode), Google displays a page that says that, in Incognito, “you can browse privately, and *other*
 4 *people who use this device won’t see your activity.*” Google similarly explains in the Chrome
 5 Privacy Notice and elsewhere that Incognito “limit[s] the information Chrome stores *on your*
 6 *system,*” including “basic browsing history information.” This is true and undisputed: In Incognito,
 7 Chrome browser’s “History” does not record the websites visited during the Incognito session so
 8 that “other people who use this device won’t see your activity.”

9 Incognito also provides privacy in other ways. For example, when a user starts a new
 10 Incognito session, she is automatically logged out of her Google Account (and thus session activity
 11 is not saved to her Account). Incognito also creates a “fresh cookie jar,” so cookies set on the
 12 browser *before* the session are not shared with the websites visited (or the web-services on the
 13 site). Thus, the device appears as a first-time visitor to websites and any services on those
 14 sites. Google’s disclosures teach new cookies may be placed on the browser *during* an Incognito
 15 session and “are remembered while you’re browsing, but deleted when you exit Incognito
 16 mode.”¹ Accordingly, Google does not associate the data received during an Incognito session with
 17 the user or her device after the Incognito session ends.

18 Plaintiffs offer a litany of soundbites from Google’s productions to color the Court’s view
 19 on the merits, but all are taken out of context and ignore key testimony from Google witnesses—
 20 including those who authored the very documents Plaintiffs tout. Far from bolstering Plaintiffs’
 21 claims, Google witnesses consistently testified that the company’s disclosures regarding Incognito
 22 mode are “clear and accurate.” *See, e.g.*, Palmer Dep. Tr. 41:12. These out-of-context snippets
 23 designed to inflame and not inform cannot change the fact that Plaintiffs’ legal claims are meritless.

24 **3. LEGAL ISSUES**

25 The parties’ first Joint Case Management Statement includes a summary of the legal issues.
 26 Given Judge Koh’s recent motion to dismiss ruling upholding Plaintiffs’ breach of contract and UCL
 27

28 ¹ <https://support.google.com/chrome/answer/7440301#>

1 claims (Dkt. 363), the following two causes of action will also need to be adjudicated: Plaintiffs'
 2 Sixth Cause of Action (Breach of Contract) and Plaintiffs' Seventh Cause of Action (Cal. Bus. &
 3 Prof. Code § 17200).

4 **MOTIONS**

5 Motions Decided Since the Last Joint Case Management Conference Statement (Dkt. 275)

6 The Court denied Google's motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint (Dkt.
 7 363) and granted Plaintiffs' motion for an extension of the discovery deadlines and Google's motion
 8 for an extension of its time to file an Answer (Dkt. 377). The parties briefed numerous discovery
 9 disputes before Magistrate Judge van Keulen, some of which have been resolved. Dkts. 288, 298,
 10 307, 335, 353, 358, 359, 365, 385, 393. The Court also issued orders related to the ongoing Special
 11 Master discovery proceedings. Dkts. 297, 318, 336. The Court granted various motions to seal
 12 (Dkts. 276, 285, 286, 306, 320, 341, 350, 380), granted in part and denied in part one motion to seal
 13 (Dkt. 330), granted one motion for admission *pro hac vice* (Dkt. 346) and issued an order appointing
 14 commissioners pursuant to the Hague Convention (Dkt. 369).

15 Plaintiffs' Additional Position: The Court has denied Google's motions for relief from
 16 Magistrate Judge van Keulen's orders (Dkts. 359, 365), permitting Plaintiffs to depose Google
 17 officers Lorraine Twohill and Sundar Pichai. Google's motions were filed on January 3 and January
 18 10 (Dkts. 375, 382). The two-week time period for the Court to rule on them expired on January 17
 19 and 24, respectively. Because Judge Koh retained this case until January 24 (14 days after Google's
 20 second motion), and did not rule Google's motions, they are "deemed denied." L. Civ. R. 72-2(d).
 21 Below, Google incorrectly implies that Judge Koh stopped working on this case following Chief
 22 Judge Seeborg's December 23 Notice regarding potential reassignment (Dkt. 364). In fact, Judge
 23 Koh continued ruling on motions, including by issuing a January 4 order resolving two motions.
 24 Dkt. 377 (after Google filed its appeal of the Ms. Twohill deposition order). Judge Koh could have,
 25 but chose not to, rule on Google's appeals before this case was assigned to Your Honor, and
 26 Plaintiffs respectfully submit that they should be permitted to proceed with those depositions.

27 Google's Additional Position: Google disagrees that its motions for relief regarding the
 28 depositions of its Chief Executive Officer (Dkt. 382) and Chief Marketing Officer (Dkt. 375) have

1 been “deemed denied” under Local Rule 72-2(d), which states “[t]he Clerk shall notify parties when
 2 a motion has been deemed denied.” The parties have not received any such notice. The motions
 3 for relief were filed after Chief Judge Seeborg indicated this case would be transferred to a new
 4 presiding Judge due to Judge Koh’s confirmation to the Ninth Circuit. *See* Dkt. 364. The case was
 5 reassigned to Your Honor before the 14-day period expired. Dkt. 391. Given these procedural
 6 circumstances, and that the motions have not been deemed denied under the language of Local Rule
 7 72-2(d), Google asks that this Court adjudicate them. They are the first and only discovery
 8 objections that Google has taken up to the District Court, and they raise important, meritorious
 9 objections to the Apex discovery sought by Plaintiffs.

10 Pending Motions

11 Plaintiffs have moved for leave to file a Third Amended Complaint (Dkt. 395) to revise their
 12 class definitions, which Google opposes. Plaintiffs’ Rule 37(b) motion for evidentiary sanctions
 13 (Dkt. 292) has been stayed pending resolution of the issues before Special Master Brush (Dkt. 297).
 14 One motion to seal remains outstanding. Dkt. 370.

15 Anticipated Motions

16 *Plaintiffs’ Statement:* Plaintiffs anticipate submitting additional discovery disputes to
 17 Magistrate Judge van Keulen, will move for class certification, and may also seek summary
 18 judgment and/or adjudication on certain claims or issues.

19 *Google’s Statement:* Google anticipates opposing class certification and moving for
 20 summary judgment on all or some of the defenses and claims.

21 **5. AMENDMENT OF PLEADINGS**

22 Pursuant to stipulation of the parties, Judge Koh previously granted Plaintiffs’ request for
 23 leave to file their Second Amended Complaint. Dkt 138; Dkt 136-1 (“SAC”). Plaintiffs have moved
 24 for leave to file a Third Amended Complaint. Dkt. 395. Google opposes Plaintiffs’ attempt to amend
 25 their Complaint again.

26 **6. EVIDENCE PRESERVATION**

27 The parties reviewed the ESI Guidelines and conferred regarding evidence preservation.

28 *Plaintiffs’ Statement:*

1 Plaintiffs remain concerned that Google is not preserving relevant records of Google's
 2 collection and use of private browsing data. Plaintiffs raised some of these concerns in their Rule
 3 37(b) motion for evidentiary sanctions. Dkt. 292. On December 3, 2021, Plaintiffs sent Google a
 4 draft letter brief identifying particular preservation deficiencies, including by pointing out that the
 5 April 2021 order which Google cites below was "without prejudice to Plaintiffs' ability to raise a
 6 challenge based upon new evidence not currently before the Court." *Calhoun* Dkt. 174. That order
 7 was issued before the Special Master process began, through which Google has been required to
 8 identify the particular logs, data sources, and fields that contain data which should be preserved.
 9 Google has preserved class identification data in other privacy cases, and it has no excuse for why
 10 it did not preserve such a small subset of relevant information for this case. Plaintiffs plan to raise
 11 these issues with Magistrate Judge van Keulen.

12 ***Google's Statement:***

13 There is no deficiency in Google's preservation efforts. Magistrate Judge van Keulen has
 14 already ordered that "Google need not suspend its standard retention periods applicable to data logs
 15 that reflect event-level data of Chrome users in the United States." *Calhoun*, Dkt. 174; *see also* Dkt.
 16 147-1 at 1 (referring to *Calhoun* order). Further, Plaintiffs filed their Rule 37(b) motion over three
 17 and a half months ago (Dkt. 292), and Magistrate Judge van Keulen stayed briefing *sua sponte* five
 18 days later (Dkt. 297 at 2) and vacated the hearing on November 8, 2021. Dkt. 324. Plaintiffs' draft
 19 letter brief merely restates the baseless arguments in the Rule 37(b) motion.

20 **7. DISCLOSURES**

21 The parties exchanged initial disclosures on September 8, 2020. Plaintiffs served amended
 22 disclosures on March 16, 2021.

23 **8. DISCOVERY**

24 The parties have engaged in substantial discovery, including document production,
 25 depositions, written discovery, and an ongoing Special Master process. To date, Google has
 26 produced more than 6.6 million pages of documents from 42 custodians and the Named Plaintiffs
 27 have produced over 1,000 pages. As for depositions, Google has deposed three of the Named
 28 Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs have deposed twelve Google witnesses, including two Rule 30(b)(6)

1 witnesses. The Court recently extended the close of fact discovery to March 4, 2022 (Dkt. 377),
 2 and the parties are working hard to meet that deadline. The parties previously agreed to and the
 3 Court entered a protective order (Dkt. 81) and an ESI order (Dkt. 80), and the ESI order was
 4 subsequently modified by the Court (Dkt. 91).

5 ***Plaintiffs' Statement:***

6 Unless the parties can resolve their disputes, Plaintiffs currently anticipate filing the
 7 following with Magistrate Judge van Keulen: (i) a joint letter brief regarding disputed 30(b)(6)
 8 deposition topics; (ii) a joint letter brief regarding Google's refusal to answer certain Requests for
 9 Admissions and Interrogatories; (iii) a joint letter brief regarding Google's refusal to produce
 10 custodial documents from the employee who led the company's 2020 efforts to quantity and identify
 11 Incognito traffic within Google's logs; and (iv) Google's failure to preserve relevant evidence.
 12 Plaintiffs have sent Google draft letter briefs covering all four of these disputes. Google's claim
 13 below that these disputes are "unripe" is belied by the fact that Google has already provided drafts
 14 of the letter briefs for disputes (i) and (iii) and has agreed to brief (ii). Plaintiffs continue to seek
 15 Google's response for item (iv).

16 In addition, Plaintiffs are growingly increasingly concerned with Google's failure to abide
 17 by Court-ordered deadlines for the data production process being overseen by Special Master Brush.
 18 See Dkt. 331 (Court order setting deadlines). The Court-ordered process calls for Google to
 19 complete four separate iterative searches and productions. Google was supposed to complete
 20 production for the first of those four searches by November 26, 2021, but Google only this week
 21 even purported to complete that production. With three iterative searches left, Plaintiffs are
 22 concerned there will not be enough time for their experts to evaluate the data in advance of the
 23 March 18 deadline for expert reports. In the Court's own words, this data production process is
 24 intended to provide "Plaintiffs the tools to identify class members using Google's data, to quantity
 25 interceptions of certain private browsing data, as well as to formulate damages models." Dkt. 331
 26 at 4. Plaintiffs are raising these issues with Google and the Special Master and, if necessary,
 27 Magistrate Judge van Keulen.

28

1 ***Google's Statement:***

2 The parties are briefing the first, second, and third disputes that Plaintiffs identify above.
 3 With respect to the fourth dispute, the Court has already granted a Protective Order for Google
 4 regarding the preservation of evidence (Dkt. 147-1), and Magistrate Judge van Keulen ruled that
 5 Google need not respond to Plaintiffs' motion relating to the same issues. Dkt. 297 at 2. Plaintiffs'
 6 unilateral approach of sending draft letter briefs for certain disputes before any meet and confer has
 7 been conducted, violates the letter and spirit of the meet and confer process under the Local Rules
 8 of the Northern District of California and Magistrate Judge van Keulen's Civil and Discovery
 9 Referral Matters Standing Order. It has resulted in unproductive meet and confers that diminish any
 10 meaningful opportunity to resolve disputes without burdening the Court.

11 Plaintiffs "concern" with the technical process of producing event-level data is no fault of
 12 Google, which has been faithfully following the expert guidance of Special Master Douglas Brush
 13 and the clarifying orders of Magistrate Judge van Keulen. Google has completed the searches and
 14 productions ordered by the Special Master; Plaintiffs have not yet provided the search terms and
 15 parameters for any further searches.

16 **9. CLASS ACTIONS**

17 Plaintiffs will file a motion for class certification, due on May 26, 2022. Dkt. 377. Counsel
 18 for the parties have reviewed the Procedural Guidance for Class Action Settlements.

19 ***Plaintiffs' Statement:***

20 Plaintiffs' claims involve uniform Google contracts, representations, and practices during
 21 the class period (back to June 1, 2016), with Plaintiffs seeking monetary and injunctive relief for a
 22 nationwide class. As confirmed by Google's internal documents, this case involves "common"
 23 misconceptions (GOOG-BRWN-00042388) based on uniform Google disclosures and practices,
 24 with Google presenting the Incognito Splash Screen (at issue in Judge Koh's rulings) every time a
 25 user started using Incognito. Plaintiffs' claims are well suited for class treatment. *E.g., In re*
 26 *Facebook, Inc. Internet Tracking Litig.*, 956 F.3d 589, 601 (9th Cir. 2020) (noting intrusion on
 27 seclusion and invasion of privacy claims turn on "reasonable expectation of privacy" and
 28 "reasonable person" standard); *Opperman v. Path, Inc.*, No. 13-CV-00453-JST, 2016 WL 3844326,

1 at *11 (N.D. Cal. July 15, 2016) (certifying intrusion upon seclusion claims because “elements can
 2 be proven on a common basis”); *Ewert v. eBay, Inc.*, No. C-07-02198 RMW, 2010 WL 4269259, at
 3 *7 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 25, 2010) (with “standardized agreement” the “court need not delve into the
 4 actual knowledge of individual class members”); *Ellsworth v. U.S. Bank*, N.A., No. C 12-02506 LB,
 5 2014 WL 2734953, at *20 (N.D. Cal. June 13, 2014) (“courts routinely certify class actions
 6 regarding breaches of form contracts”). In her most recent motion to dismiss ruling, Judge Koh
 7 explained that “the contract must be interpreted objectively” and that “the objective meaning of a
 8 contract is determined by reading the contract ‘from the perspective of a reasonable [Google] user.’”
 9 Dkt. 363 at 23 (quoting *In re Facebook, Inc., Consumer Priv. User Profile Litig.*, 402 F. Supp. 3d
 10 767, 789 (N.D. Cal. 2019)) (alteration in original). “By offering an interpretation about what
 11 Plaintiffs ‘reasonably expected,’ Plaintiffs provide that perspective.” *Id.* Google’s argument that it
 12 does not violate the Chrome promise to not save “(private) browsing histories,” by having Chrome
 13 instead route the data onto remote Google servers, is disingenuous and a uniform breach of contract.

14 This case involves Google’s systematic and uniform collection of private browsing
 15 information from millions of Americans (*see* Section 2, *supra*), but Plaintiffs are also still awaiting
 16 certain discovery relevant for purposes of seeking class certification.

17 ***Google’s Statement:***

18 Dozens of Google and third-party disclosures, including countless public articles, explain
 19 exactly how Incognito mode works – (1) Chrome does not save the users’ browsing history or
 20 information entered in forms (unless the user signs into their Google Account) and (2) cookies and
 21 site data are deleted after the user closes all Incognito windows and tabs. This is also consistent
 22 with how other browsers disclose private browsing modes. Simply put, the fact that private
 23 browsing modes are not intended to block *all* data transmissions to third party web-service providers
 24 is not a secret. *See, e.g.*, <https://www.w3.org/2001/tag/doc/private-browsing-modes/> (stating that
 25 “[t]he Web should be accessible in private and normal browsing modes” and recommending that
 26 “browser vendors should work towards achieving private browsing mode [that] work in a way
 27 indistinguishable . . . from the normal mode, to respect the user’s . . . privacy in choosing it”). And
 28 to the extent proposed class members did read one or more of these disclosures, Judge Koh held that

1 “the fact that a contract is ‘reasonably susceptible’ to one interpretation does not mean that the
 2 contract is not ‘reasonably susceptible’ to a competing interpretation.” Dkt. 363 at 19. Thus issues
 3 of express and implied consent, consumers’ actual expectations with respect to private browsing
 4 modes, and the inability to actually identify class members given how private browsing functions,
 5 among myriad other issues, prevent the certification of the proposed class.

6 **10. RELATED CASES**

7 The parties are not aware of any related cases or proceedings pending before another judge,
 8 court, or administrative body.

9 **11. RELIEF**

10 *Plaintiffs’ Statement:*

11 As stated in their Second Amended Complaint (Dkt. 136-1), and without any changes in
 12 their proposed Third Amended Complaint (Dkt. 395-2), Plaintiffs seek the following relief:

- 13 ● compensatory damages, including statutory damages where available;
- 14 ● nominal damages;
- 15 ● non-restitutionary disgorgement of all of Google’s profits that were derived, in whole
 or in part, from its collection and use of private browsing information;
- 16 ● restitution of the value of the private browsing information that Google improperly
 collected, including any diminution in value as a result of Google’s conduct;
- 17 ● injunctive relief (including deletion of all private information collected by Google);
 and
- 18 ● any other relief the Court deems appropriate.

22 Plaintiffs are still in the process of calculating damages, in part based on Google documents
 23 quantifying the financial impact of limiting Google’s collection of private browsing information. In
 24 2020, shortly before this lawsuit was filed, Google employees calculated that one change (blocking
 25 third-party cookies by default) to one private browsing mode (Incognito mode for Chrome) resulted
 26 in [REDACTED] (GOOG-CABR-04455208). That is one
 27 basis upon which Plaintiffs are calculating damages. Plaintiffs are entitled to these damages under
 28 many of their claims, including their breach of contract claim. “The Ninth Circuit has said that

1 ‘under California law, a defendant’s unjust enrichment can satisfy the “damages” element of a
2 breach of contract claim, such that disgorgement is a proper remedy.’’ *In re Google Assistant Priv.*
3 *Litig.*, No. 19-CV-04286-BLF, 2021 WL 2711747, at *14 (N.D. Cal. July 1, 2021) (quoting *Foster*
4 *Poultry Farms, Inc. v. SunTrust Bank*, 377 Fed. App’x 665, 669 (9th Cir. 2010)).

5 **Google Statement:**

6 Google objects to Plaintiffs’ attempt (again) to litigate the merits of their damages theories
7 in this Joint CMC Statement (*see* Dkt. 275 at 2-3, 21), which is premature and inappropriate. Google
8 will address Plaintiffs’ damages theories at the appropriate time.

9 **12. SETTLEMENT AND ADR**

10 No settlement discussions have taken place. Pursuant to ADR Local Rule 3-5 and Civil Local
11 Rule 16-8, on August 19, 2020, the parties met and conferred regarding the available dispute
12 resolution options and filed their respective ADR Certifications. The parties do not believe that
13 ADR is appropriate at this time.

14 **13. CONSENT TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR ALL PURPOSES**

15 The parties have not consented to have a magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings.

16 **14. OTHER REFERENCES**

17 Apart from the current Special Master process, the parties do not believe the case is suitable
18 for reference to binding arbitration, a special master, or the JPML.

19 **15. NARROWING OF ISSUES**

20 The parties are working together to see if there are issues that can be narrowed by agreement
21 or otherwise to expedite the presentation of evidence at trial.

22 **16. EXPEDITED TRIAL PROCEDURE**

23 The parties believe this case should not be handled under the Expedited Trial Procedure of
24 General Order No. 64 Attachment A.

25 **17. SCHEDULING**

26 On January 4, 2022, the Court granted Plaintiffs’ Motion for Relief from Case Management
27 Schedule, extending the case deadlines. Dkt. 377. Here is the current case schedule:

28

Action	Deadline
Fact Discovery	March 4, 2022
Opening Expert Reports	March 18, 2022
Rebuttal Expert Reports	April 15, 2022
Close of Expert Discovery	May 19, 2022
Class Certification Motion	Motion: May 26, 2022 Opp'n: July 14, 2022 Reply: August 11, 2022
Class Certification Hearing	September 22, 2022

18. TRIAL

12 *Plaintiffs' Statement:* Plaintiffs currently estimate the trial in this case to last approximately
 13 days.

14 *Google's Statement:* It is premature to estimate trial length at this time and Google proposes
 15 to revisit the issue at a later CMC. It is likewise premature to determine whether any claims will
 16 survive summary judgment and will be resolved by a jury.

17 19. DISCLOSURE OF NON-PARTY INTERESTED ENTITIES OR PERSONS

18 The parties previously filed their certificates of interested entities (Dkt. 14, 52) and have no
 19 updates.

20. PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

21 All attorneys of record for the parties have reviewed the Guidelines for Professional Conduct
 22 of the Northern District of California.

23 21. OTHER MATTERS

24 None.

1 DATED: February 4, 2022

2
3 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
4 SULLIVAN, LLP

5 By /s/ Diane M. Doolittle

6 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
7 dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
8 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
9 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
11 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

12 Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
13 andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
14 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
15 Chicago, IL 60606
16 Tel: (312) 705-7400
17 Fax: (312) 705-7401

18 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
19 stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
20 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
21 violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
22 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
23 Los Angeles, CA 90017
24 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
25 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

26 Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)
27 josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com
28 Carl Spilly (admitted *pro hac vice*)
carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com
carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com
1300 I. Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-538-8000
Facsimile: 202-538-8100

Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 875-6600
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Attorneys for Defendant
Google LLC

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 DATED: February 4, 2022

SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.

2

3

By /s/ Amanda Bonn

4

5

6

7

Amanda Bonn (CA Bar No. 270891)
abonn@susmangodfrey.com
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 789-3100

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)
mmao@bsflp.com
Beko Rebitz-Richardson (CA Bar No. 238027)
brichardson@bsflp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 293 6858
Facsimile (415) 999 9695

James W. Lee (*pro hac vice*)
jlee@bsflp.com
Rossana Baeza
rbaeza@bsflp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
100 SE 2nd Street, Suite 2800
Miami, FL 33130
Telephone: (305) 539-8400
Facsimile: (305) 539-1304

William Christopher Carmody (*pro hac vice*)
bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
Shawn J. Rabin (*pro hac vice*)
srabin@susmangodfrey.com
Steven Shepard (*pro hac vice*)
sshepard@susmangodfrey.com
Alexander P. Frawley (*pro hac vice*)
afrawley@susmangodfrey.com
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (212) 336-8330

1 John A. Yanchunis (*pro hac vice*)
2 jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
3 Ryan J. McGee (*pro hac vice*)
4 rmcgee@forthepeople.com
5 Ra O. Amen (*pro hac vice*)
6 ramen@forthepeople.com
7 MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.
8 201 N Franklin Street, 7th Floor
9 Tampa, FL 33602
10 Telephone: (813) 223-5505
11 Facsimile: (813) 222-4736

12 Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805
13 MORGAN & MORGAN
14 711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500
15 San Francisco, CA 94102
16 Tel: (415) 358-6913
17 mram@forthepeople.com

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ATTESTATION

I, Amanda Bonn, hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 5-1, that the concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

DATED: February 4, 2022

By: /s/ Amanda Bonn